

LETTER

TO THE

REV. MR. J E B B,

WITH REFERENCE TO HIS

DECLARED SENTIMENTS

ON THE

UNLAWFULNESS

OF

RELIGIOUS ADDRESSING

CHRIST JESUS

LONDON:

JOHN CALVERT & SONS, 1, THE LANE, COVENTRY,
EDWARD STREET.

MDCCLXXVII.

LETTER

TO THE

REV. MR. J. B. B.

WITH REFERENCE TO THE

DECLARED SENTIMENTS



UNION

1852

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CHRISTIANITY

LONDON:

JOHN GALE, 15, N. B. ST. N. B.

1852

PRINTED

P R E F A C E.

HAVING been accustomed to consider religious addresses unto *Christ* as founded on the New Testament, I thought it incumbent on me, for my own satisfaction, after reading Mr. (now Dr.) *Jebb's* so flat and positive denial of their lawfulness, to examine the grounds upon which he rested the vindication of that assertion; the more, indeed, because, from some publications which I had seen, I entertained a favourable opinion both of his penetration and probity. With this view, therefore, the remarks on Mr. *Lindsey's* reasoning, to whose book, as unanswerable, the Dr. hath referred us, were, in the main, originally drawn up in the year 1775; the same being the year in which *The Short State of the Causes of his Resignation* was published. But they were afterwards thrown into their present form, and improved by the addition of some criticisms on different passages of several more recent pieces than Mr. *Lindsey's* Apology, in which the same notion is avowed and maintained; and, having been hereon shewed to some friends, were by them thought to contain a full refutation of it, and, on that account, to be worthy of being perused more extensively.

P R E F A C E.

In deference, then, to their sentiments I now print them, as I do not know that any author hath pre-occupied the subject, and discussed, in the manner I have here done, Mr. *Lindsey's* exceptions to the texts of scripture, which are alleged for invocation of *Christ*, his plea from the passage of *Origen* against it, and other topicks, insisted on by him, to prove the offering of prayers and praises to the Lord *Jesus* altogether unwarrantable. How far they overthrow that position which they oppose, about the impropriety of all addresses to him, by evincing there is the authority of scripture for them, while they do not pretend to canvass those points, about which persons, who acknowledge this, are divided among themselves, every reader, into whose hands the following letter may fall, will judge for himself. Mean time, it is hoped no expression will be found in it, which any, who may doubt or disallow the justice of my arguments, can, with reason, complain of, as repugnant to those rules of charity and candour; according to which all, who make a credible profession of receiving *Jesus* as their master, and his gospel as the standard of their faith and practice, ought to treat one another, amidst the variety of their apprehensions concerning truth and duty.

4. OC 58

Note. I always quote the pages as in the 2d edition of Mr. *Lindsey's* Apology, printed in 1774.



C O N T E N T S.

DR. Jebb expressly condemns all religious addresses to Jesus Christ, and refers his readers to Mr. Lindsey's *Apology* for the proof hereof, — — — page 2

Examination of Mr. Lindsey's reasoning against the argument for such addresses to Christ, from Acts i. 29.
— — — — — pages 2—5

of ditto's reasoning against the argument for such, from Acts vii. 59. with remarks on Theophilus's proposed translation of the passage, and on what is further said by Mr. Lindsey on this text in the sequel to his apology, — — — — — pages 5, 6, &c.

— — — — — against the argument from Revel. i. 3, 6. — — — — — pages 7—12

— — — — — against the argument from Revel. vi. 13. — — — — — pages 12—15

— — — — — against the argument from 1 Tim. i. 12. — — — — — pages 15, 16.

— — — — — against the argument from 2 Cor. i. 3. Rom. i. 7. 1 Thessal. iii. 21. 2 Thess. ii. 16. with remarks on Theophilus, — — — — — pages 17—23

— — — — — against the argument from 2 Cor. xii. 8. — — — — — pages 23, 24.

— — — — — against the argument from 1 Cor. i. 2. where are some observations on a passage in Dr. Clarke's

CONTENTS.

Clarke's scripture doctrine, and animadversions on Theophiles, together with the author of objections to Mr. Lindsey's interpretation of the first fourteen verses of St. John's gospel, — — — pages 29—35

— — — — — against the argument from Revel.
xxii. 20. — — — — — pages 35, 36.

Reflections on Mr. Lindsey's interpretation of Matth.
xyiii. 20. — — — — — pages 36—39.

His reasoning from Christ's example in praying always to God his Father considered, — — — pages 39, 40.

His reasoning from Christ's words, John xvi. 21. as a prohibition to pray to himself examined, pages 40—43.

Mr. Lindsey's assertion, that no religious worship was paid to Christ through the three first centuries,
— — — — — page 43

The opinion and practice of the ancient church, after the death of the apostles, of no moment in contradiction to scripture, — — — — — pages 43, 44.

Instances of religious addresses to Christ in Ignatius and Polycarp, who lived within that period, page 44—46.

Examination of Mr. Lindsey's account of Origen's sentiments about praying to Christ, and evidence he did not disallow all religious addresses to Christ, pages 46, 47.

Conclusion, — — — — — pages 56, 57.

LETTER

The Reverend Mr. J E B B, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

I Read with eagerness your short state of the reasons which induced you to resign the rectory of *Horsfield* and vicarage of *Flixton* soon after its publication, as I had also done Mr. *Lindsey's Apology* on resigning the vicarage of *Catterick*. And I acknowledge it is matter of commendation that you quit the emoluments of your places, when you could not hold them longer, without violating the dictates of conscience, by officiating according to your station in the service of the church. I am also disposed to entertain the utmost charity for you under your differences of sentiment from me, even as you profess to be animated with it towards those whose opinions are most diametrically opposite to your own. I presume, however, to offer some remarks against one notion you have avowed, and to endeavour to shew that you have fallen into a great mistake, when you condemn, as unlawful, all religious addresses to *Christ Jesus*.

B

To

To this purpose you write very expressly, page 3.
 “ I am convinced — that the addresses of Christians
 “ may, with the same propriety, be directed to the
 “ virgin *Mary* as to the person of our Lord :” but
 refer your readers, for the reasons of this assertion,
 to Mr. *Lindsey*, who hath laboured at great length
 to prove, that prayer to our Lord *Jesus Christ* is not
 authorized in the writings of the New Testament.
 I will therefore examine what he hath advanced upon
 this subject, in the same order in which he hath pro-
 posed it, and try whether it is sufficient to justify
 the conclusion you have drawn thence.

ACTS i. 24.

Now, when Mr. *Lindsey* proceeds to consider
 whether the practice of praying to *Christ* is really
 warranted by the principal texts, which have been
 alledged as the foundation for it, from the books of
 the New Testament, he first introduces *Acts i. 24.*
And they prayed and said, thou, Lord, which knowest the
hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast
chosen : and then subjoins, “ This prayer is ad-
 “ dressed to God the Father, and not to *Christ* : 1.
 “ Because, in a similar passage that follows soon
 “ after, the same apostles address their prayer in
 “ the same terms to God the Father, *Acts iv. 24.*
 “ 29. *Lord, thou art God. — And now, Lord, behold*
 “ *their threatenings, and grant unto thy servants that*
 “ *with all boldness they may speak thy word :* 2. For the
 “ reason given by *Gratius* upon the place, who quotes
 “ *Jeremiah xvii. 10. I the Lord search the hearts ;* and
 “ observes that it is the prerogative of God only to
 “ search the heart of man : It may be said, that, *Rev.*
 “ *ii. 23. Christ* saith of himself, *I am he which search-*
 “ *eth the reins and hearts.* But then this is a derived
 “ power, as plainly appears from the frequent ac-
 “ knowledgements of his receiving every thing from
 God,

" God; and, particularly, *Matt. xxviii. 18.* " *All power is given me in heaven and in earth, (i. e.) bestowed upon him, and intrusted with him, for the government of his church; but not, surely, to erect him into an equal object of worship with God who gave it him.*" See his *Apology*, pages 128, 129.

But I cannot think these arguments satisfactory for evincing, that the prayer here was not addressed to the Lord *Jesus Christ*. I admit, that, in *Acts* iv. 24, 29. the apostles address God the Father; not, however, on account of any peculiarity in the expressions which he quotes, (for surely they might also with justice have denominated *Jesus* their Lord, or Ruler, themselves his servants, and the gospel which they preached his word,) but because to none other than God the Father could they say what he hath omitted to recite: *For, of a truth, against thy holy child, Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel had determined before to be done: ver.* 27, 28. From which, not to mention any other, circumstance, it appears he was invoked through the whole. There is no such likeness and similarity, then, between that address and this under examination, (which, indeed, consists solely in the use of the word *Lord*, as the appellation of the person supplicated in both,) as obliges us to own, that, because there the apostles called upon God, the Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, they likewise did so here.—No more does there seem to be any force in your other reason for denying that the prayer, *Acts* i. 24. was offered to *Christ*: for, since you acknowledge he knows the hearts by a power derived from his Father, he might very well be applied to according to the tenor of it. There is nothing therein which requires to affirm,

that they, who presented it, supposed his discernment of the secret dispositions and views of men to have been uncommunicated, and to entitle him to equal homage and respect with God; who conferred it upon him.

On the other hand, I think there are some things which may incline to prefer that interpretation which makes the prayer respect *Christ* rather than his Father in heaven: *Jesus* is stiled *Lord* by the apostle *Peter* in his speech to the disciples just before, for persuading them of the expediency of having an additional witness, in room of *Judas*, to the capital fact of *Christ's* resurrection, from among them that had been their companions during his ministry: *Of these men, which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.* *χ. 21, 22, &c.* The effect of which speech was their appointing two candidates for that office, *χ. 23.* as again, after their nomination, they prayed, *Thou Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen.* *χ. 24.* Farther, the apostles had received full proof that *Jesus* was acquainted with the hidden thoughts and intentions of men before his death, insomuch, that, upon one occasion, they said unto him, *Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: John xvi. 30.* And *Peter*, in particular, who appears to have been the mouth of the apostles and other early believers, here had made an express declaration of his conviction of his omniscience, after he was risen, giving him, at the same time, the name of *Lord*: *Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee, John xxi. 17.* which appears, indeed, to have been very customary and familiar. See verses 15, 16.—Besides,
in

in this way, the election and choice of a successor to *Judas*, in the apostolic college, is committed to *Jesus Christ*, very suitably to his having originally constituted and formed the same: for, to whom did it more naturally belong, to supply the vacancy among the twelve now, than to him who at first appointed them? But, if these things should not be deemed of weight to establish this explication of the prayer, I am much mistaken, if, in concurrence with the observations made for evincing that there is no necessity, on account of Mr. *Lindsey's* reasons, to appropriate it unto God, even the Father, they will not determine all impartial and candid judges to reckon it a doubtful and ambiguous point, whether it should be viewed as an address to God or to *Christ Jesus*, instead of deciding positively, as he hath done, "This prayer is addressed to God the Father, and not to *Christ*."

Acts vii. 59.

Mr. *Lindsey* next considers *Acts* vii. 59. "Our translation has inserted the word *God*, when it was not in the original, as is easily perceived by its being put in Italics. Mr. *Purver* translates thus: "They stoned Stephen, who was calling on (invoking) and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit! Unquestionably *Stephen* made this request, addressed this prayer, to the Lord *Jesus*: but this can be no precedent for directing prayer to him unseen, or addressing him as God, whom the blessed martyr declares he saw with his eyes, and calls him, *ŷ 56. The son of man standing on the right hand of God*; calls him the son of man, in that his highest state of exaltation. Son of man, and God most high: what a space between!"

But, you must be sensible it is not needful, to overthrow your position, to maintain that *Stephen* addressed this

this prayer to the Lord *Jesus* as God; for, to confute it, it is enough to say that he made this request to him in a different capacity. I therefore readily agree with Mr. *Lindsey* and Mr. *Purver*, that the word *God* is a supplement of our translators; for *Stephen's* prayer, literally turned, runs as these two gentlemen have represented it. Nevertheless, it goes far to confute your sentiments, in my opinion, that *Stephen* here made request to *Christ*, as Mr. *Lindsey* himself acknowledges, though to him as mediator between God and man, as sovereign of heaven and earth, and bestower of eternal life, by the appointment of his Father, upon all properly prepared and qualified persons from our world: for, as to the plea, by which Mr. *Lindsey* would evade the argument from *Stephen's* example, "That this can be no precedent for directing prayer to *Jesus* unseen, since he saw him with his eyes," it is utterly vain and frivolous. The fitness of the prayer to *Christ* did not depend upon his being visible to him, but upon his capacity of knowing his petition about his departing soul, and his power to grant the benefit he desired, which every one, who believes *Jesus* to know men's thoughts and words, and to be vested with the disposal of celestial glory and happiness, must be satisfied would have been the same though he had been, at that time, invisible to his faithful and suffering servant. This then appears to me a good precedent for supplication to *Christ*, by all who entertain such worthy and just sentiments concerning him, in every condition and circumstance wherein they may be situated, but especially when they are about to die, by the removal of the soul from that body to which it is here joined as an instrument of action, and subject of government.*

REVE-

*Since these papers were drawn up, I have seen *Letters on the worship of Christ*, to Dr. *Horne*, by *Theobald*, in which it is said

REVELATIONS I. 5, 6.

After this Mr. *Lindsey* brings into view *Revel. i. 5.*
Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our
sins

said, page 28, the passage may be rendered, *Lord of Jesus, re-
 new my spirit; Kene law, Jesus, &c.* And, under *Stephen's* feet
 "the glory of God, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of
 God, what could be more natural to him, as the follower of
 Jesus, than to commit his departing spirit to the God of Je-
 sus, and the God of the spirits of all flesh?" But such an
 interpretation of the words appears to me most unreasonable.
Kene is frequently a vocative, and is equivalent to *O Jesus*; as
 the reader may observe, *Mat. viii. 29. Mark i. 24. v. 7. x. 47.*
Luke iv. 34. viii. 28. xvii. 13. xviii. 38. It is true it is also
 a genitive; but, even then, when the word *Kene* is construed
 with it, it is not in what grammarians call the state of govern-
 ment, but the state of concordance, agreement, or apposition.
 What inconvenience would it produce to understand it other-
 wise, and make it signify *the Lord of Jesus*, instead of the *Lord*
Jesus, in the following passages *Acts xix. 5, 10, 13, 17. xx. 24,*
35. xxi. 13. 1 Cor. i. 3. vi. 11. 2 Thess. i. 2. Add to this the
 same phrase, which *Stephen* uses, is found *Revel. xxiii. 20. Ege,*
Kene law: but who ever thought of turning it, "Come, Lord
 of Jesus?" — as *Jesus* was undeniably the person who said,
 in that place, "Behold, I come quickly!" Wherefore the church
 addresses him, in her reply, "Even so, come, Lord *Jesus*." So
 here *Stephen* is twice said to have seen *Christ* in heaven, while
 he is only said to have beheld the glory of God: wherefore he
 must also be supposed to invoke him, not his father and his God,
 in this sort of supplication. Indeed it seems to be a good ob-
 servation of *Paulus Serrinus*, who admitted that *Jesus* was the
 object of religious worship and invocation, and rejected this
 sort of *Ydolatry*, upon its being proposed by *Franciscus Davi-*
dis. That, if it had been intended, the original would have
 run, *Kene law, to take away all dangerous ambiguity.* (See
 his *Disput. cum Francisco Davido*, pag. 2.) Finally, it is of
 weight in this matter, that the *Syriac* version, so venerable for
 its antiquity and accuracy, translates the words, *O our Lord*
Jesus, renew my spirit.

Mr. *Lindsey*, in the Sequel to his Apology, pag. 69, 70, 71,
 again examines this passage about *Stephen's* invocation of *Christ*,
 in order to shew, that it does not authorise the invocation of
 him in different circumstances; and asserts, it no more proves
 that *Stephen* himself, at another time, would have prayed to
Christ.

sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. And here he says, "The very different readings of this disturbed passage in the MSS shew that it has suffered by the negligence of transcribers, which may easily be observed in *Mill and Weistain*; and therefore no certain conclusions can be formed from it. Dr. *Mill* observes (saith Dr. *Clarke*, *Scrip. Doctr.* page 146, 147.) that, in one ancient Greek MS. the words *unto him* are wanting, the reading being, *το αγαπῶντος καὶ ἀγαπῶντος*, instead of *το αγαπῶντος καὶ ἀγαπῶντος*: in which case the doxology will be, not to *Christ*, but the Father, and the passage would be read, — And from *Jesus Christ* (who is the faithful witness, the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings upon earth,) who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

But, it is easy to shew that there is no such variety in the MSS, with relation to this passage, as to pre-

vent *Christ*, then the circumstance of a person in a dream, seeing another and requesting somewhat of him, would justify him, when awake, in speaking to that person, when at a distance and out of hearing. But I apprehend few will agree with him in this opinion, as it is plain there must have been some considerable interval between the vision and invocation, while the people expressed their displeasure at his declaration of it by stopping their ears, and rushed upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and proceeded to stone him. Farther, he makes the sense of the martyr's exclamation, *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit*, to be, *Receive my life, which I give up in thy cause*: and the gloss suits very well his notions, who looks upon resurrection as the next conscious state of being for all that die. (See page 284.) But, certainly, *πνεῦμα*, here turned spirit, often signifies the intelligent and rational principle in man, which is the proper agent in virtue and vice: and it is a very natural interpretation of the words, in all who do not believe the sleep of the soul, that he desires *Christ* would take it to dwell with himself in joy and happiness.

vent our concluding, with certainty, that it contains a devout ascription to *Christ Jesus*. That this may appear, I will give an account of the different readings here, from *Mill* and *Wetstein*, so far as they are of importance.

Mill represents the following MSS to read $\nu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, *to him that loveth*, instead of $\nu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta$, *to him that loved*. *Stephan.* 4 or 15. *Alexandr. Baroc. Covel.* 2. *Leicester Code.* *Stu. of Gov.* 5: together with the *Syriac* version. Some of the same MSS. he adds also, read $\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, *to him that delivered*, instead of $\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$, *to him that washed*; viz. *Stu. Baroc. Gov.* 2: in which the *Syriac* translation agrees with them; and he pronounces this the genuine and original reading; as he observes almost all others are, that are, in appearance, incongruous and inept, *καρὰ* having been first written in the margin, by way of correction, and thence brought into the text. *Wetstein*, again, in his edition of the *New Testament*, informs us, that $\nu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ is exhibited instead of $\nu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta$, by these MSS. *A. C.* 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 27; that is, by two of the three more ancient MSS. of the *Apocalypse*, the *Alexandrian**, and that of *Ephraim*; and by twelve of the 28. later MSS. which he collated; viz. *Codes* *Stephan.* 4 or 15. *Code* *Regius*, 1826. *Code* *Baroccianus*, 3. *Code* *Cebell.* 2. *Code* *Sinaiticus*, *Code* *Leicesterensis*, *Code* *Uffenbachianus*, 1. *Code* *Cristianus*, 199. *Code* *Cassianus*, 205. *Code* *Millicanus*, *Code*

C

* Every person, who is acquainted with sacred criticism, knows that the *Alexandrian* MS. is reputed prior to the sixth century. As to the MS. of *Ephraim*, it is thus described by *Wetstein*, tom. 1. *Proleg.* p. 27. *Codex in bibliotheca regis Will. 4. m. 1007. olim Nicolai Rotuli archidiaconi, ad quem attigunt sancti tunc epistolarum Codicum 3. Syriacorum Syri epistolarum varia Græca; sub quibus, in eadem membrana atramento fœdissimè, aut potius spongia deleta, latent insignia fragmenta V. et N. Testamenti. It wants the history of the *apocalypse*, in the gospel by *John*, and is thought as old as the *Alex. MS.**

den *Wakianus*, 1. *Codex Wakianus*, 3. none of them written before the eleventh century, and some of them long after it.* I enter not into a minute detail of the MSS. which, according to the same author, read λυσαντι instead of λυσαντι; they do not equal, in number, those that have αγαπαυτι instead of αγαπησαντι.

Farther, to omit all notice of any diversity of reading, § which does not affect the sense, *Mill* tells us, that *Petavins's* third MS. hath το αγαπησαντες instead of το αγαπησαντι, in the common editions of the *New Testament*: and *Weistain* refers to that MS. which is, with him, marked 12. among the later MSS. on the book of *Revelations*, for the same reading, while he also represents it to give λυσαντες instead of λυσαντι.

But what is to be inferred from all this? Is it, that we cannot be confident the apostle ascribed glory and dominion to the Lord *Jesus* in this passage? By no means. Though we were to allow το αγαπησαντες and το λυσαντες to be the true reading, and thus to make the whole fifth, and the former part of the sixth, verse, a benevolent wish of grace and peace from *Jesus Christ*, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth, who loved us, and washed us from our sins, in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God, even his father, as Mr. *Lindsey* seems to incline; still it would be most natural

* Thus, the *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae* is thought, by *Weistain*, to have been written in the fourteenth century, and *Codex Regius* 1886. not much, if at all, sooner. The reader will easily perceive, that the MSS. which *Mill* enumerates here, are also enumerated by *Weistain*, with the addition of others which he collated.

§ Thus, some MSS. read πομπαν instead of πομπη, and βασιλειαν instead of βασίλειαν.

natural to understand the doxology, in the end of that verse, to respect *Christ*, rather than God; even his Father. For however God, even his Father; or as others, his God and Father, be last mentioned; the mention of him is only incidental in the description of the beneficent performances and achievements of *Christ*. The character, and kindness, and useful labours, of *Christ*, are the principal subjects of these verses; and therefore the *avry*, *Gl. to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever* falls most obviously and easily to be referred to him. Indeed, it ought to be the less disputed; because, such ascriptions of honour to him are, unquestionably, found in other places of scripture; Mr. *Lindsey* himself acknowledges this to be the case, particularly in 2 *Peter* iii. 18. where the apostle saith, *But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory, both now and for ever. Amen.* But there is no need for this concession: for, surely, it is most unreasonable to prefer that reading in the genitive case, on the bare authority of *Petavius's* MS. * which is ranked among the MSS. of more recent date; and, by *Mill's* own account, interpolated here and there with marginal explications and glosses to the reading, in the dative case, which is supported in perfect harmony by all the other MSS. of the *Apocalypse*; that is, three older, and twenty-seven younger, ones; and all versions, except the *Syriac*, and all fathers. It cannot, then, be doubted that there is here an act of praise to *Jesus*, as having loved men, and shed his blood for our interest and advantage: it is true even these MSS. which

* This MS. having been purchased at the sale of *Petavius's* library, at the expence of *Christina*, queen of Sweden, and by her given as a present to pope *Alexander* the eighth, is now lodged in the *Vatican* library, at Rome. See *Prolegomena* to *Mill's* *New Testament*. Sect. 1455.

agree in reading the dative case, have some little difference among themselves: but then this difference is of no moment and consequence, as to the great point before us. For, there will be the same oblation of homage to *Christ*, if, departing from the sense of our translators, which is countenanced by the majority of MSS. we should read *τῷ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* and *τῷ λογῶντι*.^a Only the continuance and permanence of his love will be signified thus, and the idea of his having ransomed us from our sins will succeed, in room of that of his having washed us from them.

I leave it, now, to the judgement of every candid reader, whether Mr. *Lindsey* had reason to say there was such confusion in the MSS. here, through the carelessness of transcribers, that no certain conclusion could be formed from the passage, and to insinuate that the doxology should be thought to relate to the Father, and not to *Christ*.

REVELATIONS V. 13.

Let us next see what Mr. *Lindsey* hath remarked upon *Revel. v. 13*. "Blessing and honour, &c. be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, for ever and ever. This, says he, is to be understood in the same way as *Acts vii. 59*. The blessing and honour is tendered to the object present and visible, and not upon the throne, but standing in the midst, verse 5. or before the midst of the throne. The reason, also, which is assigned for this worship "ship

^a It appears, that *λογῶντι* was the reading, in some books, so early as the sixth century: for *Aristas*, who is placed about the year of *Christ*, 540, and reckoned to have been bishop of *Caesarea*, observes, in his commentary on this book, that there was a double reading here with a diversity of meaning: *ἀποδοῦναι τὸν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δόξαν τῷ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ λογῶντι*. *ἀποδοῦναι μὲν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν λογῶντι*. *ἀποδοῦναι δὲ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν λογῶντι*.

"ship being paid him, shows he cannot be an ob-
 "ject of worship equal to the Supreme, viz. 1. 12.
 "his being the Lamb slain, and therefore worthy,
 "1. 2. spotless innocence, perfect virtue and good-
 "ness, tried and confirmed by sufferings. The as-
 "cribing glory and honour to *Christ* does, in no
 "degree, imply him to be God, or authorize the
 "worship of him, or prayer to him. It is no more
 "than a declaration of our reverence of him, and
 "high esteem of his most perfect moral character
 "and goodness. We may, therefore, and we ought,
 "on all occasions, to join with his apostles in say-
 "ing, 2. *Psalm* iii. 18. *To him be glory both now and*
 "*for ever!*"

Thus, he applies the observation he had made
 upon *Stephen's* prayer to this ascription. But, was
 the observation ever so well founded here, "The
 "blessing and honour is tendered to the object
 "present and visible," it would, as was then said,
 be of no force to disprove the propriety of paying
 the same to *Christ*, absent and invisible; because this
 depends not upon his visibility, but upon his
 knowledge and discernment of it: if it is reasonable
 to do him this homage, when he is seen by our
 eyes, on account of his consummate virtue and as-
 sisting grace, it must be equally reasonable to
 do it to him, when he is unseen, upon that ground,
 provided he is alike aware of it, which cannot be
 questioned. — Why, however, has he here affirm-
 ed "The blessing and honour is tendered to the
 "object present and visible?" Whatever pretence
 he might have had to assert this, with respect to the
 exclamation in the 12th verse, *Worthy is the lamb*
which was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom,
and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing, because
 it proceeded from the angels, and the living crea-
 tures, and the elders around the throne, there is no
 colour

colour for saying it, about the ascription in the 13th verse, of which he treats, unless we upon earth are capable of doing it, as well as the inhabitants of heaven, as appears from the recital of the whole of it. *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the lamb, for ever and ever.* The observation, then, is, upon this occasion, absolutely false and unjust. — Farther, though his remark will hold that the ascribing glory and honour to *Christ*, as the lamb slain, does, in no degree, imply him to be God, how does it follow, it does not authorize the worship of him? The reason he assigns for this, is "It is no more than a declaration of our reverence of him, and high esteem of his most perfect moral character and goodness." But, according to Mr. *Lindsey* himself, tendering blessing and honour to *Christ*, present and visible, was paying him worship; for he makes these equivalent expressions; by consequence, it authorized it in that situation. In the same manner, then, tendering blessing and honour to *Christ*, invisible, must be paying him worship, and authorize it in that condition. Is ascribing glory and honour to *Christ*, visible, any thing more than a declaration of our reverence of him, and high esteem of his most perfect moral character and goodness? unless we add, that it is with his consciousness of it. And is it not against the strongest assertions of scripture, about his extensive knowledge, to imagine that he can be ignorant of the declaration of our reverence and esteem, by ascribing glory and honour to him invisible? This, therefore, being also manifest, it must be equally intitled to the name of Worship. — Thus, we have, in this passage, a clear instance of paying
worship

worship to *Christ* invisible, if ascribing glory, and honour, and blessing, to him unseen may be so called, as ascribing honour, and glory, and blessing, to his God and Father, whom no man hath seen at any time, neither can see, is every day without any hesitation. Here, indeed, they are ascribed to them, in the same breath, by the whole creation, even as we read afterwards in this book, *a great multitude, which no man could number, of all kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands, and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever.* Revel. vii. 9, 10.

1 TIMOTHY i. 12.

The next text which Mr. *Lindsey* considers is 1 Timothy i. 12. *I thank Christ Jesus, our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry.* Upon which his note is, "This is no address of thanks to *Christ*, as an object of worship, but a sudden emotion of gratitude in the apostle's mind, and expression of his thankfulness to *Christ* for his own miraculous conversion (Acts ix.) and call to be an apostle."

But it seems difficult to say what addressee of thanks to God, the Father-Almighty, as an object of worship, may not be explained away, upon such principles. In these words *Paul* evidently makes a grateful acknowledgement to *Jesus Christ*, invisible in heaven, for his apostleship, which he received immediately from him, as appears by the Acts and Epistles, and for his endowment and furniture suitable unto it. It is the undeniable sense, according to all MS copies of the *Greek Testament*, except the *Clermont* one, and all versions, except the *Arabic*, which make *Paul* say, "I thank him (i. e. God) who

"who hath enabled me in Christ Jesus," &c. but which can be of no weight, when single and unsupported. And, if this is not to be admitted as an address of thanks to Christ, as an object of worship, but an expression of a sudden emotion of gratitude in the apostle's mind to Christ, for the blessings commemorated, how many grateful addresses to the God and Father of all, in the *New Testament*, as an object of worship, may, with equal ease, be degraded from that order? for instance, when Paul says, *1 Cor. xiv. 37. Thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. ii. 14. Thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the favour of his knowledge by us in every place. 2 Cor. viii. 16. Thanks be to God, who put the same earnest care into the heart of Titus for you. And once more, 2 Cor. ix. 15. Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.* May not these forms be, with the same reason, denied to be addresses of thanks to God, as an object of worship, and called only sudden emotions of gratitude in the apostle's mind, and expressions of thankfulness to God, for the different benefits specified or alluded to? And what should hinder extending the same commentary to other forms, which run, *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and then relate some effect of his goodness, as the foundation of the homage. *2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 3. 1 Pet. i. 3.* What peculiar and singular characters or terms are there, in the one or the other, to forbid their being so interpreted likewise?

2 Cor.
 of I am aware that *Weylin* tells us some MSS read *who enables me*, instead of *who hath enabled me*; But this creates no variation, as to the object of thanksgiving; nor are they of great credit or antiquity: it is the *Clementine* which reads *in Christ*, and thereby transfers the thanksgiving to God, according to the order of the words in the original,

2 Cor. i. 3. Rom. i. 7.

Grace to you, and peace from God, and the Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Thess. iii. 11. Now God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you. 2 Thess. ii. 16. succeed in Mr. Lindsey's examination.

"These," says he, "and other the like passages are only pious wishes, not prayers. That this is the true interpretation, and not mere assertion, appears from *Revel. i. 4*, otherwise, it may as well be said, that the writer prays to the seven spirits there named, which are afterwards, in the same book, called the *Lamb's Eyes*, v. 6. i. 7. *Christ's* angels, messengers, sent forth into all the earth."

I might, in reply, observe, that it is far from being an agreed point, that, by the seven spirits which are before the throne of him, who is, and who was, and who is to come, from whom *John* wishes grace and peace to the seven churches in *Asia*, *Revel. i. 4*, we are to understand seven angels. Many have thought, that thereby was denoted the holy spirit of God, the source and fountain of all these gifts and graces, which were shed down upon the seven churches addressed, as again, by the seven eyes and seven horns of the Lamb, *Revel. v. 6*, they have supposed *Jesus's* consummate knowledge and power to be signified; seven being, in scripture, a number of perfection. And they have urged, in behalf of this interpretation, not only, that it was the general sense of the ancient church, but that, in this way only, we can account for *John's* prefixing the seven spirits unto *Jesus Christ*, in the salutation. For, had he intended angels, he would have mentioned him in precedence who was their Lord and Sovereign; even as *Paul* hath said

D

in

in his first letter to *Timothy*, v. 21. *I charge thee, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.* — Now, if this be the true meaning of the expression, the argument, from this passage, against admitting the places quoted to contain prayers, must fall to the ground. But I will allow, though the reasons for such explication do not appear very cogent, that the seven spirits do stand for seven angels, who may be here, as elsewhere, * *Revel. viii. 2.* represented to be the prime ministers of divine providence, in allusion to the custom, in eastern courts, of seven persons, who had greater interest and familiarity with the king. *Ester i. 14. Ezra vii. 14. Jerem. lii. 25.* This being granted, it follows, that the salutations, in the beginning of the epistles, cannot be affirmed, from their own nature, to be prayers; since, in this, angels are introduced, as well as the eternal and unchangeable *Jehovah*, who are not intitled, according to scripture, to religious worship and invocation, nor ever have, through the whole book of *Revelation*, blessing and honour ascribed unto them, as is done unto God and the Lamb. Let them be, then, only solemn pious wishes of good from the beings therein named, as unquestionably there may be desires of good from angels, without any supposition that they perceive them, or any intention of doing them honour, as endowed with such knowledge, they being employed by the deity as instruments in dispensing his favours unto men.

Still, notwithstanding this concession, it seems violent and harsh, so to explain these two passages in the *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 1 *Thess. iii. 11, 12.* *Now may God himself, even our Father, (or our*

* Compare *Job* xii. 15.

our God and Father himself) and our Lord Jesus Christ direct our way to you, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησὺς Χριστός. — And may the Lord, ὁ Κύριος (i. e. the Lord Jesus) make you to increase and abound in love towards one another, and towards all men, as we do towards you, that he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, (or our God and Father,) at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints. And, 2 Thess. ii. 16. May our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, (or our God and Father,) who hath loved us, and given us everlasting consolation and good hope, through grace comfort your hearts and establish you in every good word and work. To which other passages might be added, wherein some blessing is implored from Christ alone, his God and Father not being conjoined with him; as 2 Thess. iii. 5. The Lord, i. e. the Lord Jesus Christ, direct your hearts into the love of God. 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus. The Lord grant unto him, that he may find mercy of the Lord, i. e. of himself, in that day. iv. 22. The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit.

I am sensible, indeed, that, in the Old Testament, we read Jacob, in blessing Joseph, said, Gen. xlviii. 15, 16. God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk; the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads. And again David, speaking of his enemies, said, Psal. xxxv. 5, 6. Let them be as chaff before the wind, and let the angel of the Lord chase them: Let their way be dark and slippery, and let the angel of the Lord persecute them. It may there-

D 2

fore

* There is no room to doubt but the Lord here means Christ Jesus, not God even our Father, though the term Lord is repeated in the next verse; for such a repetition is not unusual among the Hebrews, when the same person is still intended, See 1 Kings viii. 1. and compare 1 Cor. i. 7, 8.

fore he objected, if *David* said, *let the angel of the Lord chase and persecute his enemies*, and *Jacob*, long before his time, said, *the angel bless the lads*, yea, applied to God and the angel, in common, the same term *bless*, which was declarative of the advantage sought, without being thought to pray to an angel (for such praying would have subjected them to the charge and imputation of being idolaters) might not, then, *Paul* say, the Lord *Jesus* do this or that, apart or in conjunction with his God and Father, and even extend the same phrases, which were significant of the benefits desired at once to God and him in the manner he hath done, *Our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work. God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you*, without being supposed to pray to *Christ*? The modes of speech are so similar, that, if there be no necessity to acknowledge *David* and *Jacob* made supplication to an angel, neither can there be any need to admit that *Paul* prayed to *Christ*.* And therefore it must be unjust to reproach a different interpretation as doing force to his language.

But, in answer to the objection which may be raised from these places, and which, if I mistake not, hath been proposed by me in its full weight, let these remarks be carefully attended to.

As to the passage in the psalms, is the opinion of

**Theophylact*, in the letters above quoted, page 20. having said there is nothing more than an appearance of a petition being proffered here to *Jesus Christ*, is willing to understand by *Jesus Christ* his gospel, as if the apostle prayed, that the gospel might administer to the *Thessalonians* consolation and establishment. — But, though *Christ* may sometimes denote the gospel, it is evidently strained so to expound it here; and, in some passages, where *Christ* is in like manner introduced as here, it would be absurd to apply that comment.

of many learned men, these, like other clauses in that psalm, should be turned as predictions or declarations of *Davis's* assurance, that such evil should be inflicted on his enemies, instead of, wishes that it might befall them. Nor can it be denied that they are capable * of such translation, thus, " *They shall be as chaff before the wind, and the angel of the Lord shall chase them,*" and so on. Further, though the optative sense may seem preferable, there is no necessity to understand *angel* here of an intelligent being. The *Hebrew* doctors say, *angel* is sometimes the name of any merely material, and inanimate, or irrational, thing, which is the instrument or mean of performing God's pleasure: fire, wind, hail, or any other of the elements. So *Maimonides* tells us, who is the most learned of the Jewish masters, and most skilful in their idioms and customs, and quotes *Psal. civ. 4.* as an example of it, *He maketh his angels winds, his ministers flaming fire.* See *Mor. Nebuchin*, page 200. And the observation may commodiously be applied here. — Now, the passage of the psalmist, understood in either of these ways, is nothing to the purpose for which it is alledged.

As to the passage again, in *Genesis*, there arises a very great and difficult question, who the angel, spoken of there and in other places, is? According to some divines, he is one of that order of spiritual creatures of great understanding, and power, and holiness, which surround the throne of God in heaven, as his ministers, to execute his will, considered in his own proper nature and character. According to others, he is one of those superior beings, viewed as personating the true God, and in the quality of his representative, on different occasions, assuming the titles that belong to him, and receiving the

* See *Vindication of sacred Books, against Voltaire*, page 66.

the homage that is due to him. A third class think he was the preexistent *Λόγος*, or word, who was in the beginning with God, who formed the heavens and the earth with the fulness thereof, who made the principal manifestations of the divine will to the patriarchs and people of *Israel*, and who, in the days of *Augustus*, became partaker of flesh and blood for the redemption of men. Finally, he was the same with God himself before mentioned, in the judgement of others, who urge there is no copulative in *Jacob's* benediction, (for it does not run, *the God which fed me, — and the angel which redeemed me, — but the God — the angel which redeemed me, bless the lads,*) as there ought to have been, if two persons, and not one, had been intended. But, until it can be shewed, in a satisfactory manner, that the first of these opinions is the true one, and that the rest ought to be rejected, as little can this speech of *Jacob* derive any support to the hypothesis which I oppose. — Instead, then, of having recourse to so controverted instances of pious wishes, which are not prayers, in order to defend the position, that the *New Testament* furnishes no examples of prayers to *Christ*, let us look on the places produced, as containing such. * Especially when

* *Theses*, page 22. says very shrewdly, "a person may, at any time, use a similar phraseology with that of the apostle, (2 *Thess.* ii. 16.) without being supposed to address any other being than God. A person may pray, for instance, 'May my enemies relent and pity me, may the advocates of truth and justice defend and succour me, and may God support and deliver me;' without meaning to invoke his enemies, or the advocates of truth and justice, or to render them religious worship." But, though it were granted to be true, that a person might use this language, without meaning to invoke any human enemies, or any human advocates of truth and justice, and without being thought to intend their invocation while absent or at a distance, because they must be ignorant

when they are accompanied with what must be owned invocation and worship of God his Father, unless the form, in which Aaron blessed the people, *The Lord bless thee and keep thee, the Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee, the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace.* Numbers vi. 24, 25, 26. and similar forms, be, against all reason, denied to be of this sort. — If there should be any ambiguity in the mode of expression, this circumstance, together with the evidences which have been already, and will be hereafter, produced, of prayer to *Christ* should incline us hereunto.

2 Cor. xii. 8.

As to 2 Cor. xii. 8. *For this thing I besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from me,* Mr. Lindsey says, "Paul appears here to have directed his prayer to God the Father; and to have had in his thoughts, and imitated, our Lord's prayer in the garden, the night before his sufferings, when he prayed three times to God, that, if it pleased him the cup of affliction might pass away from him without his drinking it. *Beausobre* on the place, N. B. The apostles were not so exact in the use of the words *Lord, Saviour*, and the like, which they indifferently gave both to God and *Christ*, never supposing that any would mistake their Lord and Master, so lately born and living amongst men, to be the supreme God and object of worship." Dr. Hammond thus paraphrases, "And I earnestly prayed to God to be delivered from it."

But

ignorant hereof, it does not follow this will hold, with respect to *Christ*, who is represented in his exalted state to know all men's works and words, yea, to search their hearts and reins in every place.

But there is no such likeness or resemblance between the two prayers, as to justify this conclusion. The Lord, whom *Paul* besought, appears to be *Christ*, and not God the Father. For, the words immediately following the account of his supplication unto the Lord, that the thorn in the flesh, the messenger of *Satan* to buffet him, might depart from him, are, *1. 9. And he said unto me, my grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness: most gladly, therefore, will I rather glory in infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. 1. 10. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake; for, when I am weak, then am I strong.* Agreeably *Estius*, who was among the best commentators of the *Romish* church, and *Vorstius*, who, among the protestants, is celebrated for superior acuteness and erudition, do expressly so interpret the Lord here. It appears also to have been *Grasius's* sense of its meaning, from his annotations on the ninth verse, where he says, the person who assured *Paul* of his favour and assistance, in return to his prayer, was *Christ*, whose power is more illustrated and displayed, the more pious and holy men are visited with calamities and distresses. Moreover, it is undeniable, that, in *Paul's* epistles, the Lord is commonly used to denote the Lord *Jesus Christ*. — I forbear to quote examples of this, they are so numerous and so obvious.

1 Cor. i. 2.

Upon 1 Cor. i. 2. *With all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord*, Mr. *Lindsey's* note is as follows, "Dr. *Hammond* rightly observes "that it should be translated, 'with all them that are called by the name of our Lord *Jesus Christ*.' "In the stile of scripture, to be called by the name

“ of any one, or to have the name of any one called upon it, signifies to belong, to be the property, or to be in subjection to that whose name is called upon the other. *Daubuz on Revel.* page 130.

“ But see, in Dr. *Clarke*, (*Scr. Doctr.* N°. 691.) an enumeration of the various senses in which this phrase, *calling on the name of Christ*, and some like it, are used; among which there is none that implies directly *invoking him*, but *Acts* vii. 59. which has been considered.”

Because Mr. *Lindsey* here refers to a passage in Dr. *Clarke's Scripture Doctrine*, it will be necessary to give the reader a more full account of it. The Dr. having produced *Acts* ii. 21. *Whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved*, as a passage wherein is set forth the honour and worship which ought to be paid to the Son, writes thus:

“ To call on the name of *Christ* being a phrase, used in a great variety of senses, and, with some other synonymous expressions, signifying sometimes, believing in him, acknowledging him as our Saviour, openly professing ourselves Christians, or being baptized in his name; sometimes invoking his name upon diseased persons, in order to a miraculous cure; sometimes praying in his name, or through his intercession; sometimes directly calling upon, or invoking, him; and sometimes, perhaps, several of these significations being joined promiscuously: it may not be improper to set down the several passages, that the reader may compare them together in one view.”

Then, prefixing the first figure, he quotes in order, as instances of the signification marked therewith:

“ 1. *Acts* ii. 21. *Whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

“ *Acts* ix. 14, 21. *To bind all that call on thy name,*

" — destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusa-
 " lem.

" Acts xv. 17. All the Gentiles upon whom my name
 " is called.

" Acts xxii. 16. Be baptized and wash away thy
 " sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

" Rom. x. 11, 12, 13, 14. Whosoever believeth on
 " him, (confessing with the mouth the Lord Jesus, &
 " 9.) shall not be ashamed.

" — For the same Lord over all is rich unto all that
 " call upon him.

" — For, whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord
 " shall be saved.

" — How, then, shall they call on him, on whom they
 " have not believed? &c.

" Rom. xv. 20. Not where Christ was named.

" 1 Cor. i. 2. Called to be saints, with all that, in
 " every place, call upon the name of Jesus Christ our
 " Lord.

" 2 Tim. ii. 19. Let every one that nameth the name
 " of Christ depart from iniquity.

" 2 Tim. ii. 22. Follow righteousness — with them
 " that call on the Lord out of a pure heart.

" James ii. 7. That worthy name, by the which ye
 " are called (Gr. τὸ ὄνομα ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς, which was cal-
 " led upon you, or over you, viz. at your baptism.
 " The expression is the same as that above. Acts
 " xv. 17.)"

Prefixing the second figure, he alledges, as in-
 stances of the signification marked therewith:

" 2. Acts ix. 13. To call over them which had evil
 " spirits the name of the Lord Jesus.

" Acts iii. 6. In the name of Jesus Christ of Naza-
 " reth rise up and walk."

Prefixing the third figure, he sets down:

" 3. Hebr. xiii. 15. By him — let us offer the sacrifice
 " of praise to God — giving thanks (ὁμολογούμεν, con-
 " fessing)

“ calling) *to his name*, (or, in his name, *τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ*) or, making public profession of (our faith in) his name.”

And, prefixing the fourth figure, he quotes

“ 4. *Acts* vii. 59. calling upon, (*Gr. ἐκκαλεσάμενος*, invoking,) and saying, *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*”

Now, when the passage is thus recited at length, I have two remarks to make.

The first is, though Dr. Clarke has only produced *Acts* vii. 59. as a text in which calling on Christ denotes directly invoking him, he might understand some other of these texts, where the phrase, calling on Christ, or calling on the name of Christ, occurs, to imply prayer to him. For, having enumerated different senses of this phrase, among which that is one, he expressly observes, “ Sometimes, perhaps, several of these significations are joined promiscuously.” Accordingly, he produces many of them afterward, (not indeed all,) as evidences of the honour and worship which is to be paid to the Son, even as he had introduced *Acts* ii. 21. in this view. If, therefore, Mr. Lindsey meant to persuade the world, by his manner of speaking, as he seems to have done, that, in Dr. Clarke’s judgement, the phrase, calling on Christ, or calling on his name, implied directly invoking him, in no other of the texts he had enumerated but *Acts* vii. 59. it was more than he had authority to do; for the Dr. himself supposed several of the senses he had proposed might be, on some occasions, united or blended together.

The second is, that Dr. Clarke hath, very improperly, brought several of the texts, quoted by him for ascertaining and fixing the scripture-sense of the phrase, calling on the name of Christ, *ἐκκαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ*, or calling on him, *ἐκκαλεσάμενος αὐτόν*.

For, in some of them, the phrase neither occurs in the original Greek, nor in our translation. This is the case *Rom. xv. 20.* *εχ' ὅπου ὠνομασθῆ Χριστός, not where Christ was named.* *2 Tim. ii. 19.* *πᾶς ὁ ὠνομαζὼν τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ, &c. Every one that nameth the name of Christ.* *Acts iii. 6.* *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, &c. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk.* *Hebr. xiii. 15.* *ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, giving thanks, or confessing, to his name.* In one of them, *Acts xix. 13.* though our translation hath, *to call over them, which had evil spirits, the name of the Lord Jesus,* *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* is not in the Greek, but *ὀνομαζειν*; for it runs *ὀνομαζειν ἐπὶ τὰς ἐχούσας* — *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.* And, finally, in others of them, where *Christ's* name is said to be called upon persons, and persons are said to be called by *Christ's* name, though the verb *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* be used, its construction is so different from what it is in the phrases, turned *calling on the name of Christ*, or *calling on Christ*, that they have never been pretended, so far as I know, even by the most weak, though zealous, advocates for the invocation of *Christ*, to furnish any shadow of proof for prayer to him. So in *Acts xv. 17.* *All the gentiles, upon whom my name is called,* *ἐφ' ὧς ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα μου.* And *James ii. 7.* *That whereby name, by which you are called, (or which was called on you,) τὸ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα.*

These remarks being submitted to the consideration of the reader, with all due respect to Dr. Clarke's great name, I will endeavour to shew that the true and proper meaning of the phrase, *calling upon the name of Christ*, or *calling upon Christ*, is invocation. But, before I proceed to this, it may be convenient to take notice that the expression, which is justly turned, *to call on the name of Christ,* *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ* is only found six times in the *New Testament*, and the expression, which is rightly rendered,

to call on *Christ*, is only met with twice in it, unless we include *Acts* vii. 59. and *Rom.* x. 14. where, indeed, *Christ*, or some equivalent word, falls very naturally to be supplied, to perfect and complete the sense of the original. I place the passages of both classes before the reader at one view. The English version may be seen, pages 25, 26.

First Class.

Acts ii. 21. πᾶς ὃς ἀν ἐπικαλεσθῆται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται.

Acts ix. 14. τῆς ἐπικαλεσάμενης τὸ ὄνομα σου.

Acts ix. 21. τῆς ἐπικαλεσάμενης τὸ ὄνομα τούτου.

Acts xxii. 16. ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου.

Rom. x. 13. πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἀν ἐπικαλεσθῆται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου.

1 Cor. i. 2. οὗτοι πάντες τοῖς ἐπικαλεσμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Second Class.

Rom. x. 12. ὅσοι καὶ ἐπικαλεσθῶσιν τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου.

2 Tim. ii. 22. μετὰ τὴν ἐπικαλεσάμενόν Κυρίου.

Now, that in these passages invocation of *Christ* is intended will, I think, undeniably follow, if I prove that this is the constant acceptation of ἐπικαλεσθῆναι in the middle voice, (in which only the writers of the *New Testament* do here employ it,) wherever it occurs in the *Greek* version of the *Old Testament*, or in the *Apocrypha*, before the name of God, in the accusative case, whether in the arrangement, which the authors themselves have given it, or in that which the grammatical syntax requires; and, if I further manifest that, in like manner, it is its uniform sense where it is placed, in either of these ways, before the words, *Lord*, *God*, or before the words, *me*, *thee*, *him*, as denoting God. But how easy is this! It will, I am apprehensive, appear superfluous to most readers

to produce all the instances hereof. That I may not, then, offend by too long a detail, I shall only quote some under each head, and refer to others, which they may look into or not, as they incline. That *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*, in one or other of the tenes of the middle voice, before *the name of the Lord* or *the name of God*, signifies invoking, worshipping, praying to, the Lord, or to God, is plain.

Gen. ix. 26. — *ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου.*
Then men began to call on the name of the Lord.

Gen. xxvi. 25. — *ἐπικαλεσάμενο το ὄνομα Κυρίου.*
Isaac called on the name of the Lord.

2 Chron. xvi. 8. Call upon his (the Lord's) name.
ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.

† Psalm lxxix. 6. βασιλῆαι αἱ τὸ ὄνομα σου ἐπικαλεσάντων.
The kingdoms which have not called on thy name.

Psalm xcix. 6. — *ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλεσάμενοις τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.*
Samuel among them that call upon his (the Lord's) name.

Psalm cv. 1. ἐπικαλεσθε τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.
Call upon his (the Lord's) name.

See too Ps. cxvi. 4, 13. *Isa. lvi. 7. Jerem. 2. 24. Lament. iii. 54. Joel iii. 32. Zachar. xiii. 9.*

Again, that it is so taken before *Kyrie*, *Lord*, appears,

2 Sam. xxii. 4. αἰνετὸν ἐπικαλεσόμεαι Κύριον.
I will call on the Lord who is worthy to be praised.

Psalm xix. 4. οὐκ ἐπικαλεσάμενοι.
They call not upon the Lord.

So

• So the text is read in Alder's edition of the 76. *An. 1518*, and in that by the heirs of *Wichel* at *Frankfort, An. 1597*.

† Note. In quoting from 76, I have substituted the *Psalm* according to the *Hebrew*. I have also followed it in the denominations of the books of *Samuel* and *Kings*.

So likewise 1 Sam. xii. 17, 18. 1 Kings xvii. 21. Psal. lvi. 4. xxiii. 6. cxviii. 5. Ecclesiasticus xlv. 19. xlvii. 5. xlviii. 22. li. 14. 2 Maccabees iii. 22. vii. 37.

Finally, that it hath the same sense before the word *God*, and before *us*, *thee*, *him*, while *God* is meant, may be perceived by consulting 1 Chron. iv. 10. Jonah i. 6. Amos iv. 12. Psal. cxlv. 18. Deut. iv. 7. Ecclesiasticus ii. 10. 2 Maccabees xii. 6.*

Nor are instances of this acception of *συνάλογμαι*, in the middle voice, peculiar to the 70. version of the *Old Testament* and the *Apocrypha*, where it is construed with the term *God*, in the accusative, or any word which refers to him. There are such also in the *New Testament* itself: for, to omit 1 Cor. vii. 59. where some rightly suppose *Christ*, rather than *God*, to be involved, says *Peter*, 1 Ep. i. 17. *If ye call on the Father*, αὐτὸν προσκαλεσάμενοι: and says *Paul*, 2 Cor. i. 23. *I call on God for a record*, (Gr. ἐνυμνασάμενος τὸν Θεὸν ἐκινάλομαι,) *I call upon God as a witness on my soul*, that, to spare you, I come not as yet unto Corinth. — It is needless to subjoin any instances of its having a like sense, in like circumstances, among profane writers.

Why then should not *συνάλογμαι*, so construed with the phrase, the name of *Christ*, or with the word *Christ*, as it is in the texts alledged above, from the *New Testament*, be there understood also to denote prayer to *Christ*? Whoever compares the expressions produced from the *Old* and *New Testament*, about calling on *God*, or calling on his name, with

* In several places of the 70. version, *συνάλογμαι* is used in one or other of the tenses of the middle voice with the dative *ἐμοί*, for invocation, sometimes the preposition *ἐν* is intervening. Gen. xii. 8. xxi. 33. 1 Kings xiii. 24. 25. 26. 2 Kings v. 11. Psal. xx. 8. Psal. cxvi. 17. sometimes not, Gen. xiii. 4. The reader will observe, I refer here to Gen. xxi. 33. Ps. xx. 8. and Gen. xiii. 4. as they are read in the Aldine and Francfort editions before mentioned. The reading of the two last texts is the same also in that at Complutum in Spain, An. 1515: But there are no instances of such a construction of *συνάλογμαι* in that voice in the *New Testament*.

with those about calling on *Christ*, or calling on his name, will be sensible there is so great a likeness or similarity between them, that if the former signify, as it is evident they do, invocation of God and prayer to him, the other ought to be allowed to signify invocation of *Christ* and prayer to him, who, we are taught to believe, knows all men's works and words, and hath dominion over all things under God, even his Father.

But, says Mr. *Lindsey*, Dr. *Hammond* rightly observes that 1 *Corinth.* i. 2. should be translated "with all them that are called by the name of our Lord *Jesus Christ*." And I suppose he would substitute this as the true version in all the other places.

I answer, however, no examples of such an use of *ἐπικαλεσθαι*, in such construction as these places of the *New Testament* exhibit, can be produced to justify this interpretation.

I find it sometimes employed to signify a person or thing's being so or so surnamed and called. But then it is in the passive voice, between similar cases of the same number, as

Daniel x. 1. *Whose name was called Belteshazzar,*

ἡ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐπικληθῆναι Βελτσαζάρ.

Malachi i. 4. *And they shall be called by them borders of wickedness.*

καὶ ἐπικληθήσονται αὐτοῖς ὅρια ανομίας.

Ecclesiasticus xlvii. 18. *Kyrie te ἐπικαλεσμένον Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ.*

In the name of the Lord, who is surnamed the God of Israel,

Luke xxii. 3. *Judas, surnamed Iscariot.*

Ἰούδας τοῦ ἐπικαλεσμένου Ἰσκαριώτην.

Acts x. 18. *Simon, surnamed Peter.*

Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλεσμένος Πέτρος.

See too *Matt.* x. 3. *Acts* i. 23. iv. 36. x. 5.

32. xii. 12. 25. xv. 22. *Hebr.* xi. 16.

I find

I find the verb *ἐπικαλομαι* likewise used, where the denomination of a person or thing, from another, is declared; but then it is always in the passive voice, and το *ονομα* makes the nominative or accusative before it, at least, in order of syntax, while the person or thing thence deriving appellation, comes after in the dative, with or without the preposition *ἐν*, or in the genitive, or in the accusative, with it. This will be best understood from the examples annexed.

Gen. xlviii. 16. *My name shall be named on them.*
Ἐπικαλεσεται αυτοις το ονομα μου. (Ald. & Wessel.)

Deut. xxviii. 10. *The Name of the Lord hath been called upon thee.*
Ονομα Κυριου ἐπικεκληται σου. (Ald. & Wessel.)

3 Sam. vi. 2. *The ark of God, on which the name of the Lord of Hosts hath been called.*

Κλησιν το Θεον, ἐφ' ἣν ἐπικληθη το ονομα, &c.

2 Kings viii. 23. *Thy name hath been called upon this house, or, as in our text version, this house — is called by thy name.*

Ονομα σου ἐπικεκληται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.

2 Chron. vii. 14. *My people, which are called by my name, or, as the margin hath it, upon whom my name is called.*

Ἐγὼ εἰς ἐπικεκληται το ονομα μου.

So also 2 Chron. vi. 33. Jerem. vii. 10, 11, 14, vii. 30, xiv. 9, xv. 16, xli. 13, xxxix. 34. (Hab. & Engl. xxxii. 34, xxxiv. 15.) Daniel ix. 18, 19. Amos iii. 14. 2 Maccabees vii. 37.

But I do not find any instance, in the 70. of the use of *ἐπικαλομαι*, in the middle voice, where the denomination of a thing or person is spoken of, except one, where the phraseology is very different from

from that in those texts of the *New Testament*, into the import of which I have been enquiring. It is *Psal. xlix. 11. They called their names on their lands*, or, as we have it, *they called their lands after their own names*;

ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕΣΑΝΤΟ ΤΑ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΝΙ ΤΩΝ ΓΥΝΩΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ.

Upon the whole, therefore, I think it ought to be concluded, that invocation of *Christ*, and not being denominated from him, is the genuine meaning of the places under controversy. I only add, it may give some weight to this opinion with several, to observe that the learned *Wetstein*, who was far from being distinguished for orthodoxy of theological belief, seems to have understood calling on *Christ's* name of direct invocation. *

REVEL.

* In his note on 1 *Cor. i. 2.* he says, *Paulus ab ecclesia Corinthiaca distinguit omnes ubicunque locorum invocantes nomen Domini. Illi sunt qui Corinthi fidei fuerant, hi mercatorum et nautarum hospites qui Christo nomen dederant, cumque, modo Corinthi, modo in patriam reversi, invocabant.*

Theophiles, in his *Letters on the Worship of Christ*, page 14, &c. saith, "The word *ἐπικαλεσάμενος*, in the *New Testament*, does never necessarily signify, when followed by an accusative case, to invoke or worship, but always naturally to appeal to, to refer a cause to, or to submit to the jurisdiction or authority of another." And accordingly explains all those passages in our translation, which speak of calling on *Christ* and calling on his name, of referring our cause to him, or submitting to his authority, *viz.* that authority which he received from the Father. But, though the word *ἐπικαλεσάμενος* does signify appealing from an inferior, to a superior, judge, in those passages of the *New Testament*, where *Paul's* measure, that he might be reserved to the hearing of *Augustus*, is spoken of: (This being, as it were, an invocation of the emperor to take cognizance of his cause, and to vindicate his innocents against his accusers, *see Acts. xxv. 11, 21, 25, and xxvi. 32. xxviii. 19.*) it may be left to every reader, with some confidence, I think, to determine, whether the other sense is not the easy and obvious one, after he hath seen that it is the constant acceptation of similar phrases about God and God's name, in the *Old Testament*. For, that this

REVEL. xxii. 20.

Upon this text, *Revel. xxii. 20. Come, Lord Jesus!* Mr. *Lindsey's* observation is very short. "These words are only the reply of the apostle, addressed to the Lord *Jesus* present with him in the vision, who had said, immediately before; *I come quickly by.*"

Nor need I be long in considering it. Be it that this short petition was made to *Christ* present with him in vision, in return to the declaration he had given about his intention to come speedily, it is plain, as was before said, if all things are manifest to *Christ* in every place, it must be equally proper to offer a

F 2

request

this is the case, some, who have entertained the same sentiments with the author, frankly acknowledge. So Mr. *Hayes*, in those extracts which Mr. *Lindsey* hath given us from his book, "The scripture account of the attributes and worship of God, and of the character and offices of *Christ*," *Sequel of Apology*, page 56. "ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου is used in the Septuagint very often, and always signifies to call upon, or invoke by prayer and adoration the Lord, the God of *Israel*." And ἐπικαλεῖσθαι Κυρίον καὶ Θεόν signify the same."

The acute and dispassionate author of objections to Mr. *Lindsey's* interpretation of the first fourteen verses of St. *John's* gospel, having said, page 60. "He would give no forced interpretation to the expression, who should translate τὸ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα σου, *Acts* ix. 14. and τὸ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 *Cor.* i. 2. those who are called, or surnamed, after thy name, the name of the Lord *Jesus*," adds, in support of this opinion, "This is no uncommon construction of Greek passive verbs, and is, to the full, as grammatical as (ἐκλεῖσθαι) ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *Rom.* iii. 3. or αὐτοῦ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, 1 *Cor.* ix. 17." But, though this observation may be true, since, according to the writer himself, the verb ἐπικαλεῖσθαι frequently signifies invocation by prayer, in the 70. version of the *Old Testament*, and since this signification alone gives a commodious sense in some places of the *New*; as *Acts* vii. 59. *Rom.* x. 13, 14, 15. 1 *Peter* i. 17. while it is also suitable here, why should any affix to it, in this place, the passive sense of being called or surnamed, of which there is no instance, as often as it occurs in similar construction, through the Greek version of the *Jewish* scriptures?

request to him, though he may not be so present. Such presence or absence does not affect his knowledge of mens desires and his capacity to fulfil them.

MATTH. xviii. 20.

Mr. Lindsey, last of all, considers *Matth. xviii. 20.* For, where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them.

It may be proper, says he, to take notice of this text, though out of its course, lest we should pass by any thing of consequence in the argument.

The following seems to be a valuable explication of it:

"If we consider the whole of this passage, in which our Lord is speaking of the great power of which his apostles should be possessed, and especially of the efficacy of their prayers, we shall be satisfied that he could only mean, by this form of expression, to represent their power with God, when they were assembled as his disciples, and prayed as became his disciples, to be the same as his own power with God; and God heard him always. That our Lord could not intend to speak of himself, as the God who heareth prayer, is evident from his speaking of the Father in this very place, as the person who was to grant their petitions." ver. 19.

Le Clerc, in his *Harmony*, seems to have had somewhat of the like thought, "where two or three, &c. it will be the same as if I was amongst them, and praying to God along with them."

But I do not find this text hath been explained of prayer to *Christ* by any commentator, nor produced

* *Familiar Illustrations of certain passages of scripture.*—printed for *Johnson*, *Paul's Church-Yard*, 1772. p. 26, 27.

† *Ipse inter eos esset, et Deum cum illis conjunctione oraret, confessor*

as an argument for it by any controversial writer in theology, with whom I am acquainted. Our Saviour speaks so plainly of prayer to his Father in heaven in the preceding verse, saying, *If two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven,* that all interpreters, who have either restrained the text to prayer, or have made it, in its meaning, to comprehend it, have expounded it, not of prayer to *Christ*, but to his Father that sent him. The author therefore might have saved himself the labour of considering it. At the same time, I cannot think he hath represented the genuine sense and design of the Lord *Jesus*. I enter not into debate with him, whether the declaration should be understood to relate to the apostles only, or whether it should be extended to disciples in every age and country. Neither do I enquire into the import of *being gathered together in his name*, whether it signifies being assembled from a regard to his appointment and glory, or being assembled to request a blessing for his sake, or being assembled, with such dispositions and views in general, as became those who honoured him as a divine teacher. I confine myself wholly to the kind and gracious assurance which *Christ* gives of his being in the midst of them, *When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* This Mr. *Lawley*, after the writer of *Familiar Illustrations*, &c. makes equivalent to his saying, they should have the same power and interest with God as he himself had, who was always heard by him in his petitions, or, according to *Le Clerc*, the success and efficacy of their prayers would be the same, as if he was one of their company, and prayed to God along with them. But why should the phrase be so narrowed? It seems to have been a kind of proverbial expression for favourable and friendly treatment of those, to

whom such affirmation was made. In *Psalms* xlii. 5. it is said, *God is in the midst of her*, the city of *Jerusalem*, meaning, he is her protector and defence against her enemies. So it follows, *She shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early*. In *Joel* ii. 25, 26, 27. God, having promised great plenty and abundance of food, by making the floors full of wheat, and causing the fats to overflow with wine and oil, so that they should eat and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord their God, that had dealt wondrously with them, adds, *And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel*. And, in both passages, the Greek translation hath the precise words which *Jesus* employs here, *ἐν μέσῳ*. In several other places the same Hebrew term occurs, which is, in these two, rendered *ἐν μέσῳ*, viz. *דָּבָר* as *Deut.* i. 42. vii. 21. xxxi. 17. *Numb.* xiv. 42. though the Greek interpreters have turned it variously.* However, it will appear uncontestible to any, who will be at the pains to look into them, that God was said to be in the midst of the *Jews*, when he shewed them tokens of his kindness, and ordered things for their good and welfare, but not to be in the midst of them, when he visited them with calamities in testimony of his displeasure. — When therefore *Christ* promises, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them*, the design must be according to the uniform and invariable acceptation of the phrase, to assert that he would be careful of, and active for, their benefit and advantage. Says *Dr. Whitby*, "There will I be in the midst of them to speed their petitions." Says *Dr. Doddridge*, "I am there by my special though inviolable presence, in the midst of them, and will shew

* In the English version, it is, in all these places, rendered *among*. Though, in *Psalms* and *Joel*, *in the midst*. In the 70. it is *ἐν*, or *ἐν μέσῳ*. It is remarkable that *ἐν μέσῳ* is *Christ's* expression in the promise, *Matth.* xxviii. 20.

“ shew, by all proper interpositions of my divine power, the regard I have to their interest and their prayers.” Says Dr. *Clarke*, “ There I am always ready to assist and join with you, and intercede for you.” What a happiness for any society, greater or smaller, to have him thus in the midst of them! Since his mediation with God for those, whom he regards with complacency and approbation, is continually successful. — Since the angels are his ministers to execute his orders for their welfare, and since he hath the disposal of all events committed unto him.

Thus, sir, I have examined all these texts of the *New Testament*, which Mr. *Lindsey* hath considered, and pronounced to be no warrant for addresses or prayers unto *Christ*: and, if I mistake not, have shewed, that his opinion, in this matter, is ill grounded, with respect to them all, if you except *Matth. xviii. 20.* which ought not to have been enumerated among the passages of scripture, whereupon the advocates for that practice do rest its defence.

As to his argument from *Christ*'s own example, that, because he always prayed to God his Father, therefore Christians should never pray to *Christ*, however impossible he may think, by any device, to evade or set aside its force, it seems to me totally inconclusive. I suppose Mr. *Lindsey* will allow, *Christ* never applied to his Father for any thing in his own name, i. e. as his own disciple, according to that author's explication of that phrase. But, will it follow from this, that we are not to ask the Father in his name? It may be said, no. For he hath expressly enjoined us to do so, which is not the case about prayer to him. But, would the consequence have been good, though he had given no such direction,

if

* See Mr. *Lindsey*'s Apology, pages 120, 124, 137.

if his apostles, in their writings, had asked blessings from the Father in his name? I think no man can hesitate to answer, it would not. Why, then, should such an inference be made from *Christ's* example, in praying only to God his Father, unless it be evinced that the apostles have set no pattern of praying to *Christ* as well as to the Father.

Mr. *Lindsey* ventures to say, * "Our Saviour *Christ* seems, in words as express as can be used, to forbid mens offering prayer to himself, *John* xvi. 23. *In that day ye shall ask me nothing: verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, in my name, he will give it to you.* Hitherto, he had been all along present with his disciples, as it were, in God's stead, in some respects, with a divine power to heal bodily diseases, to instruct in the divine will, to forgive sins, and to comfort and establish them in his faith. In consequence of which, they had recourse to him in all their wants and distresses, *Matthew* viii. 25. *Lord, save us, we perish. — Luke* xvii. 5. *Lord, increase our faith.*—But, as he was now soon going to be withdrawn from them, he acquaints them, that when that event took place, they were no more to apply to him for any thing, but to God the Father, (the common Father of him, and of them all,) in his name, that is, as his disciples, relying on his authority, and in virtue of those assurances and promises from God which he had given them."

But, if this interpretation be just, that *Christ* forbade prayer to himself, after the event of his removal from them should take place, it must be admitted by Mr. *Lindsey* himself, that *Stephen* sinned in his expiring moment. For what was the last act of his life, but saying, *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit?* which he

* See Mr. *Lindsey's* Apology, page 121.

he owns, expressly, to have been a prayer addressed to him. But surely this is too shocking and absurd to be affirmed. I would add, likewise, that the apostles must have transgressed in these passages, which Mr. Emmsley calls only pious wishes, but denies to be prayers. For, if, in wishing any blessing from God the Father, they asked something of him, they applied to him for something, how can it be thought they did not ask something of Christ, or apply to him for something, when they expressed their desires of the communication of any thing from him in the like form of words, whether it be called praying or not? But can any bear such a foul imputation on them? We may then be satisfied that we should reject this interpretation and look out for another.

Now, there occur two very easy and natural ones, neither of which creates such inconveniences. The one is, that the import of these words of Christ, *In that day ye shall ask me nothing*, is, In that season, when you have received the Holy Spirit to be your teacher and instructor, through whose abode with you your joy shall never be taken away by any malice or power of men, you shall not put questions to me for the solution of your doubts and difficulties, as you have sometimes done, and have been now desirous to do, but restrained by a fear of incurring my displeasure. And, in support of this sense, it may be observed, that we are expressly told, *J. 17. 18, 19. Then said some of his disciples among themselves, what is this that he saith unto us, a little while and ye shall not see me, and, again, a little while and ye shall see me, and because I go to my Father? They said, therefore, what is this that he saith, a little while, we cannot tell what he saith. Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him, and said unto them, do ye enquire among yourselves of that I said, a little while and ye shall not see me, and,*

again, a little while and ye shall see me? Yea, the very same word *ἰσταναι* is used, when it is said, *Jesus* knew that they were desirous to ask him, which we meet with here, in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Nor is it an uncommon sense of it, *to enquire, to interrogate*, as may be seen *Matth. xvi. 13. xxi. 24. John i. 19. and y. 30.* of this chapter. Indeed, though it sometimes stands for petitioning, or requesting, *Matth. xv. 23. Mark vii. 26. Luke vii. 3.* the other is the most common acceptation of it, both in sacred and profane writers. Further, which seems remarkable, it is not employed in the next clause of this 23d verse, as an English reader might imagine, nor indeed through the following verse, when *Christ* confessedly speaks of prayer by men to his Father; but a different word, *αἰτεω*, which has no such ambiguity. We only find it in that notion in the end of the 26th verse, where *Christ* says, *I say not unto you, I will pray the Father for you.*

The other explication is, that, when *Christ* says here, *In that day ye shall ask me nothing.* he means indeed, by asking, making requests unto him, preferring petitions unto him, which is acknowledged to be, sometimes, signified by the original word; but then he is to be understood with restriction and limitation. *At that time, after I am gone away to heaven, you shall not address me any more, face to face, as you have been accustomed to do, upon appearance of danger and difficulty.* Which will connect very well with the sequel. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, in my name, he will give it you.* For it will be as if he had subjoined, "But it need not give you uneasiness, that you will not then have opportunities of petitioning me, in the same manner as now, for, whatever requests you make to the Father, in my name, will be heard and fulfilled." Or in this way, "At that time, after you

“ you receive the Spirit, you will not make any such
 “ injudicious requests to me, through your fond
 “ mistakes and carnal affections founded thereon,
 “ as you have sometimes done, and some of you did
 “ very lately. *Matth. xvi. 22. Mark x. 35.* Your
 “ requests will be reasonable and spiritual, and be-
 “ coming the directions and nature of my religion,
 “ which will be granted by my Father.” The reader
 may choose which of these interpretations he
 pleases. It ought not then to have been said, that
Christ, in these words, prohibited his disciples to
 pray to him; since such a construction of them, to
 borrow *Dr. Doddridge's* expression, would make *Paul*
 to have lived, and *Stephen* to have died, in a very
 unwarrantable, perhaps an idolatrous, practice, and,
 without offering any force or violence to his lan-
 guage, may with such facility be avoided.

Mr. Lindsey asserts that it was the universal opi-
 nion and practice of the Christian church, with little
 or no variation, for the first three centuries, to ad-
 dress religious worship only to the one true God,
 the Father; (compare pages 142, 147, 148.) and
 produces, in support hereof, the following passage
 out of *Origen de Orat. p. 48.* which he remembers
 not to have seen cited by any one. “ But, if we
 “ would learn,” says that excellent person, “ what
 “ prayer is, we must take care not to pray to any
 “ creature, no not even to *Christ* himself; but to
 “ the God and Father of the universe alone; to
 “ whom this our Saviour himself offered up his
 “ prayers, as we have shewn before, and also teach-
 “ eth us to offer up ours. For, being once asked,
 “ teach us to pray, (*Luke xi. 1.*) he teacheth not to
 “ pray to himself, but to the Father, saying, *Our*
 “ *Father, who art in heaven, &c.*” page 142.

Upon this argument I must observe, though it
 could be proved that it was the universal opinion

and practice of the Christian church for the first three centuries, (I mean after the death of the apostles, into whose sentiments and practice we have already enquired,) not to present religious addresses to *Christ*, but only to his Father and his God, it would be of no importance at all in the controversy, unless it could be shewn, in contradiction to what hath been said, that the omission hereof was authorized by scripture. For, as Mr. *Lindsey* himself says, in the preface to the Sequel of his Apology: p. 18. "It is by the scripture alone, that the opinion of the apostolic fathers, about the person of *Christ*, and all other opinions concerning him, are to be tried." Were the notions and addresses of these primitive writers and their contemporaries, together with those of their successors, till christianity became the established religion of the Roman empire, ever so distant from, and opposite unto, the religious invocation of the Lord *Jesus*, they could be no rule to us, nor have any force and validity at all against the word of God.

But indeed it cannot be maintained, that, in the first and best ages, Christians directed all their prayers to the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Wherefore our author hath qualified his assertion, and admitted there was, at least in some instances, a variation from that method of address. *Ignatius*, bishop of *Antioch*, who suffered martyrdom in the year of our Lord, 116, or sooner, supposes, in his letter to the *Ephesians*, that they prayed to *Christ*. For, he says, chap. 20. "If *Jesus Christ* count me worthy through your prayer, and it be his will, I will, in the second little book which I am about to write unto you," do so and so. And, in his epistle to the *Romans*, chap. 4. † he says, "pray

* Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοὶ ὁ Θεὸς πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ σοὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. &c.

† Αἰνῶμεν σοὶ ὁ Θεὸς πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ σοὶ ὁ υἱός σου ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. I quote the smaller epistles, which are thought genuine and almost altogether free from interpolations.

"ye to Christ for me, that, through these organs, (or instruments, he means the wild beasts, to which he was to be thrown, that he might be by them devoured,) "I may be found a sacrifice."

I must also mention a passage, which we have in the relation of Polycarp's martyrdom by the church of Smyrna, in their letter to the church of Philadelphia and other churches. Now Polycarp was bishop of the church of Smyrna, nay, is thought, by many, to have been the angel of that church, to whom the epistle in the Revelation is sent. For they understand Polycarp's words to the proconsul, before his death in the year 166, or thereabouts, "Eighty and six years have I now served Christ," not of the space from his conversion to christianity, but of that from the commencement of his ministry, which carries back the date of it to the year 80 in the first century. The passage in the letter, however, which I mean, is not that in the 14th chapter, where Polycarp, in a prayer of his, according to the present Greek copy, says to God, speaking of his having counted him worthy to drink of Christ's cup, &c. "For this and concerning all things I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved son, with whom, to thee and the Holy Spirit be glory both now and for future ages, Amen." For I acknowledge that the words differ, both as they are quoted by Eusebius,† who hath inserted the greatest part of the narrative in his Ecclesiastical History, lib. 4. cap. 15. and, as they are translated agreeably

to the Latin copy, which is thus: "Propter hoc et propter omnia gratias ago tibi, Domine, et benedico tibi, et glorifico te, cum filio tuo Jesu Christo, cum Spiritu Sancto, in presentia et in futuro seculorum, Amen."

† Eusebius has the words as follows: "Propter hoc et propter omnia gratias ago tibi, Domine, et benedico tibi, et glorifico te, cum filio tuo Jesu Christo, cum Spiritu Sancto, in presentia et in futuro seculorum, Amen."

bly to his quotation, in the main, in the old Latin version, published by *Usher*. Since there the expression is, "*For this, &c. I glorify thee through the eternal high Priest,*" (the Latin adds, "*the all-powerful*;) Jesus Christ." It might, therefore, be said, with great probability, that they had * been altered and changed, in later ages, to favour the invocation of *Jesus*. The passage I build on is in the 17th chapter, where the church of *Smyrna*, having represented the care of their enemies to withhold *Polycarp's* body from them lest they should worship him, adds, "They are ignorant † that we shall not be able, at any time, to forsake *Christ*, who suffered for the salvation of all the world of the saved, the innocent for sinners; nor to worship another; for him indeed, being the son of God, we worship; but the martyrs, as disciples and imitators of *Christ*, we love, deservedly, on account of their invincible affection to their own king and teacher."

As to the passage in *Origen's* Treatise on Prayer, in which, however, he affirms nothing about the received custom among the Christians, but only declares his own judgement, I pretend not to blame *Mr. Lindsey's* account of it as unfair, though, in the Benedictine edition, which exhibits *Fleurbaey's* version, *Origen* is represented to express himself with some doubt and hesitation, in this manner: "If we will understand

* *Le Clerc* hath remarked, that *Eusebius's* reading is in a stile more apostolical. *Eccles. Hist.* p. 729. This, I suppose, is not merely on account of the expression, quoted in the text from *Eusebius*, but on account of the sequel in him, "by whom to thee with him in the Holy Spirit be glory, &c." while the ancient Latin version hath, "Through whom, to thee, and with him, and with the Holy Spirit, be glory, &c."

† *Αγαπῶμεν δὲ αὐτοὺς τοὺς Χριστοὺς κατὰ δόξαν διδασκῶντας, ὥστε ὅτι ἵπποκρίτους οὐκ ὀφείδωμεν, τούτοις μὲν γὰρ, οἷος ὅτι αὐτὸ ἐν Θεῷ, ἀποκρίνεται μὲν, τοὺς δὲ μαρτυράς, — ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως —*

" understand what prayer is, perhaps, we must never pray to any thing begotten, not to Christ himself."

But si quis dixerit, et non solum Christo, sed et aliis rebus, &c. At si intellexerimus quid sit oratio, forte nullus unquam genitus erit orandus, ac ne Christus quidem ipse, &c. Orig. Oper. Tom. 1. pag. 222. Sed. 15. id. Bened. But it will be necessary to shew what precedes, and what follows, this passage, and then to make some remarks, the more that Origen's fame and authority have been great, though this must cause some proximity.

In the 14th section, page 220. having quoted 1 Tim. ii. 1. he acquaints us how he distinguished between *deprecations*, *supplications*, *prayers*, *intercessions*, and *thanksgivings*. *Supplication* he makes a wish sent up, by him who wants any thing, about obtaining it in a humble manner, (*suppliciter*) and quotes, as examples of it, Luke i. 3. Exod. xxxii. 11. Deut. ix. 18. Esther xiii. 8. xiv. 3. *Prayer*, again, he defines to be a wish, sent up by a person about greater things, in a higher disposition, with doxology or praise. The *deprecation* (*deprecatio*) is a wish, which produces, as instances of it, Daniel iii. 25. 1 Sam. i. 10. Habak. iii. 1. Jonah ii. 2. &c.

The *Oxford* editor hath, after *deprecation*: but it is not in MSS; and therefore is not in the *Benedictine* edition. There is no reason for limiting the definition of prayer thus, more than of *deprecation* or *intercession*, nor do the examples, which Origen gives, authorize such a restriction: so, as *Philon* hath observed sometimes to happen, is put for *intercession*. See the notes of the learned Englishman in *Reading's* edition. *Orationem esse quam quis de majoribus rebus elatiore animo Deum glorificando petit.* Which is translated, *postulationem, petitionem, etiam ad Deum ab eo factam, qui maiore quadam confidentia utitur.*

intercession he next explains to be a request of things
 from God, by him who hath some greater boldness
 or confidence, and attributes to the Holy Spirit, *Rom*
viii. 26. to *Job. x. 12.* and to *Samson. Judg. xvi. 30.*
Thanksgiving. in *Gen.* he makes a confession or ac-
 knowledgement for having received good things from
 God, *Gen. xlviii. 22.* and quotes *Christ's* words, *Luke x.*
21. as a specimen of it. This, he says, is their
 meaning, if we will understand names properly. ~~Thereafter he adds, it is~~
 not unreasonable to offer supplication, intercession,
 and thanksgiving, to men; and, whereas intercession
 and thanksgiving may be presented to all men, suppli-
 cation may only be offered to holy men. If any *Pro-*
phet or *Paul* be found, that they may profit us, mak-
 ing us worthy to obtain the benefit of the power
 bestowed upon them, with relation to the remission
 of sins. Except when one, who is not holy, hath
 been injured by us, for, in that case, he who hath
 suffered by our trespass against him may be suppli-
 cated, that he may grant us pardon who have wronged
 him. But, if these things are to be offered to men,
 how much more should we give thanks to *Christ*,
 who hath done us so great kindnesses by the will of
 the Father? But we must also make intercession
 to him as *Stephen*, who said, *Lord, lay not this sin to*
their charge, and, imitating the father of the lunatic,
 we say, *I beseech, (or I supplicate, *deprecari*.) O Lord,*
have mercy on my son, or myself, or any one.

Then come in the words lately quoted from the be-
 ginning of the eighth section. But, if we will understand
 what prayer is. And it is immediately subjoined,
 For, if the Son is different from the Father in
 substance and essence, *et. ~~etiam~~ non ~~intercedimus~~, I ~~no~~*

Intercedimus. So *Benedictine* editors. The common reading
intercedimus, and some *intercedimus* of persons, while *intercedimus*
denotes

ther we must pray to the Son, and not to the Father, or to both, or to the Father alone. To say we should pray to the Son, and not to the Father, every one will acknowledge to be most absurd, and against evidence. But, if we are to pray to both, it is plain we must pray plurally, *do ye afford, do ye good, do ye bestow, do ye save,* and the like; which is neither meet in itself, nor exemplified in scripture. It remains, therefore, that we pray to the alone God, the Father of the universe, but not without the high priest, who hath been established with an oath by the Father, *Pf. cix. (cx.) 4.* — The saints, therefore, giving thanks to God in their prayers, render thanks to him through *Jesus Christ*. But, as he who studies accuracy in praying ought not to pray to him who prayeth but to the Father, whom our Lord *Jesus* hath taught to call upon in prayers, so no prayer should be offered to the Father without him, as he himself sheweth clearly by saying, *John xvi. 23, 24. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, in my name, he will give it you. Hisberto, have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.* For he said not, *ask me,* nor *ask the Father,* simply, but, *if ye ask any thing from the Father, in my name, he will give it you.* A little after, *Origen* goes on, “If any one think he ought to pray to *Christ* himself, producing us this passage, *and let all the angels of God worship him,* from

H

denotes the subordination of the Son to the Father. But, says the learned Englishman, whose notes *Reading* hath published, *υποτακτης* is never used by the fathers to denote that subordination. Nor does it govern a genitive, as here it is made to do; the words in the Greek being, *αυτο υποτακτης τον θεον ο υιος του θεου*. Nor does *Origen* seem here to treat of the Son's subjection, but of his distinction only, as a different person from the Father; so that he prefers *υποτακτης*, a *pater alias secundum essentiam et suppositum*, meaning person or *υποτακτης*, while the nature is one with that of the Father.

the book of *Deuteronomy*, (xxii. 43. in the 70. and *Hebrews* 9. 6.) we must say to him, that the church, named *Jerusalem* by the prophet, is said to be worshipped by kings and queens, who become nursing fathers and nursing mothers to her." And, having quoted to this purpose, *Isaiah* xlix. 22. he subjoins, "Can any other thing be said, according to him who replied, *Why callest thou me good? there is none good, except one*, God the Father, than this, *why prayest thou to me?*" You must pray to the Father alone; to whom I also pray, which you learn by the sacred scriptures. For you must not pray, *συνεχθαι*, to him who hath been constituted an high priest for you, by the Father, and who hath received to be advocate by the Father, but through the high priest and advocate, who can sympathize with your infirmities, having been tempted in all things like to you, but tempted through the Father's gift unto me without sin. Learn, therefore, how great a gift ye have received from my Father by regeneration in me, having obtained the spirit of adoption, that ye may be called the sons of God and my brethren. For ye have read the word, spoken through *David* by me concerning you to the Father, *I will declare thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the church will I praise thee*. But it is not fit that these should pray to a brother, who are honoured with one father as himself. For you must send up your prayer to the Father alone with me and by me."

Then he proceeds in the sixteenth section, "Hearing, therefore, *Jesus* say these things, let us pray to God through him, all saying the same thing, and not divided about the manner of prayer. Are we not divided if some pray to the Father, and some to the Son?"

Having

Having thus placed before my readers a long passage of *Origen*, I must now, as I promised, make some remarks.

1. It appears from *Origen's* own acknowledgments, that some Christians, in his days, presented prayers unto *Christ Jesus*. The last words of the passage, just now produced, are a proof of this. I need not transcribe them here.

2. Though *Origen* here denies that what he calls prayers were to be offered to *Christ*, he holds that supplications, and intercessions, and thanksgivings, were to be made to him; which is very contrary to their principles, who maintain the unlawfulness of all religious addresses to him. These assertions of *Origen* cannot have escaped the attention of any reader.

3. *Origen* hath been thought to propose his opinion about the impropriety of prayer to *Christ* with some doubt and hesitation. I have already taken notice how *Fleuri's* version of his words, at the beginning of the 15th section, runs in the strain of uncertainty. The Benedictine editor, *De la Rue*, in his notes on *Justin's* *Origénistes*, at the end of the fourth volume of *Origen's* works, makes such an observation: For, upon *Lib. 2. Quest. 2. Sect. 29.* having turned *Origen's* words interrogatively, *Sed, si intelligimus quid sit precatio, num foris ulli rei genita fundenda est?* &c. he adds, *suam ergo sententiam proponit dubitans, ut in re longe quaesita magis quam necessaria*, that is, he mentions his sentiment dubiously, as in a matter far sought rather than necessary. But I lay no stress upon it. For, granting that the clause may admit of such a translation, he hath positively, and without any suspense, condemned prayer to *Christ* in other parts of the passage above quoted.

4. There is a subtilty and niceness of distinctions here between prayer and supplication and intercession, quite untenible and indefensible. The instances

which Origen himself produces to support them do not, by any means, authorize them. To this purpose, says the Benedictine editor in the place referred to, *Revera allata ab eo exempla obsecrationis et supplicationis non minus magnifica sunt quam precationis; neq. Mardocheus divinam majestatem exiliis praeferat, cum ait, Domine, Rex omnipotens, quam cum Habacuc dicit, Domine, audiui auditum tuum, et timui.* The meaning is, The examples of supplication and intercession, alledged by Origen, are no less magnificent and glorious to God than these of prayer which he brings; nor does *Mordecai* in a lower degree celebrate the divine majesty, when he says, *Ester* xiii. 8. O Lord, O Lord, King Almighty, &c. than *Habacuk*, when he says, O Lord, I have heard thy bearing, and was afraid. Now the former Origen had quoted as a supplication, the latter as a prayer. And the remark might be extended to other instances, as whoever has an opportunity may satisfy himself, by an inspection and comparison of the places.

5. Origen himself, elsewhere, admits of prayer to *Ebrist*. For, in his fifth book against *Celsus*, *Sect.* 4. he writes thus, "We must send up all supplication, and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving, to the God over all, through the High-priest over all angels, the living Word of God. But we will supplicate the Word himself, and intercede with him, and pray, if we can distinguish the propriety of diction (or expression) about prayer, and the abuse of it."^o

Again, in his eighth book, page 386. *quarto edit.* (*Bened. edit. vol. 1. pag. 751.*) he says, "But we worship the one God, and his one son, and word, and image, with supplications and requests, according to our

^o Δευόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ προσόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, καὶ προσευόμεθα δὲ, καὶ δεόμεθα κατὰ τὴν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς εὐρεθείαν, καὶ κατὰ τὴν εὐχὴν. *Quarto edition, p. 233.*

our ability, bringing to the God of the universe prayers, through his only begotten; to whom we first offer them, beseeching him, who is the propitiation for our sins, to present, as High-priest, our prayers, and sacrifices, and intercessions to the God over all.*

Moreover, in the same book, page 395. (Bened. edit. 1. 761.) he says, "We must pray to the alone God over all, and we must pray to the only begotten, and the first-born of the whole creation, the Word of God, and we must ask him, as High-priest, to carry up our prayer, which arriveth first unto him, to his God, and our God, and to his Father, and to the Father of them who live according to the word of God.†

I only add, he grants, in the fifth book, sect. 11, that prayers are to be offered to the Word, not as to a mediator, but as to one who is himself able to bestow blessings on men. *Quarto edit. p. 238.* "Let such a one pray to the Word of God who is able to heal him, and much more to his Father, who sent forth his Word to the righteous of old, and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions."‡ Thus

* Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἰσὺ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λόγον, καὶ ἰκνού, τὰς πάντας τὸ δύναται ἡμῶν ἰατρίας καὶ ἀφίκασι, σέβουμεν, προσκύνουμεν τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ὄντι τῆς ὑπὸς διὰ τὸ μνηστεύει αὐτὸν ἢ πρῶτος προσφέρει αὐτὰς, ἀφίκασι αὐτοῦ, διασώζει οὕτως πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν, προσκύνουμεν, ὡς ἀρχιερεῖς, καὶ ὑπὸς, καὶ τῆς δύσεως, καὶ τῆς ἐνταῖας, καὶ μὴ τῷ ὄντι πρὸς Θεῷ.

† Μὲν γὰρ προσκύνει τῷ ὄντι πρὸς Θεῷ, καὶ προσκύνει γὰρ τῷ μνηστεύει καὶ πρῶτος αὐτοῦ πρὸς αἰσθητικῆς, λόγον Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀφίκασι αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀρχιερεῖς, τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ φθασαῖας ἡμῶν ὑπὸς ἀφίκασι τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεῷ ἡμῶν, καὶ πρῶτος αὐτοῦ καὶ πρῶτος τῷ βίοντι αὐτοῦ τῷ λόγῳ τῷ Θεῷ. — In his book *de Oracione*, 549: 10. pag. 172. Bened. edit. Tom. 1. Op. Orig. he speaks of Christ as praying together with them, for whom he mediates unto the Father, συνερχομαι, — for the Son of God is High-priest of our oblations, and advocate with the Father, praying for them that pray, συγχωρεῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν συγχωρησάντων.

‡ Ὁ τοῦτοῦ ὑπὸς τῷ λόγῳ τῷ Θεῷ, δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἰατροῦ, καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα τῷ αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ, ὡς καὶ τοῖς πρῶτοις δικαίοις ἐξουσιάζει τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, &c. (Bened. edit. 586.)

Thus *Origen* himself, in these books against *Celsus*, admits, in different places, that we are to pray to *Christ*, to offer prayers to him. Now these books may be supposed to contain his ripe and more mature judgement. For, whereas the *Treatise on Prayer* was written soon after the year of *Christ*, 231, when he left *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, to go to *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, these books against *Celsus* appear to have been composed in the year of *Christ*, 249, under the emperor *Philip*, successor of *Gordian*, when the church had enjoyed long peace, *Maximinus's* persecution having ceased 12 years before, and still there was great confusion in the civil state of the empire, through *Decius's* rebellion, preceded by that of the *Tetrapions* in *Syria*, and *Marius's* in *Pannonia*. See lib. 31 against *Celsus*, quar. ed. pag. 120. and *Euseb. Hist.* 6, 36, and prefaces to these pieces of *Origen*, in the *Beneditine* edition. 6. Finally,

There are also passages in his Latin homilies, in which he speaks of praying to *Christ*. In his 12th homily on *Ezekiel*, lect. 5, he says, that the axe, which is spoken of in the Gospel, may never be laid at our roots, let us pray more attentively to our Lord *Jesus Christ* with his Father. — *Attentius Jesum Christum, Dominum nostrum, cum patre suo, precamur.* In his 15th homily on *Luke*, he says, that therefore we, standing in the temple, and holding the Son of God, and embracing him, may be worthy of forgiveness, and of advancement to more excellent things, let us pray to Almighty God, and let us pray to the little *Jesus*, whom we desire to speak to, and to hold in our arms. *Uti igitur et uni, stantes in templo, et tenentes Dei filium, complexantesque eum, digni remissionis et promotionis ad meliora simus, oramus omnipotentem Deum, et ipsum parvulum Jesum, quem alloqui et tenere desideramus in brachiis.* In his homily, once more, on the Epistle to the Romans, chap. 10. he says, *Sicut offerimus Deo Patri orationes, ita et Domino Jesu Christo; et, sicut offerimus postulationes Patri, ita offerimus postulationes et Filio—unum namque utrique honorem deferendum divinus decet sermo, cum dicis, ut honorificent Filium, sicut honorificent Patrem.* But these are translations only, the two former by *St. Jerome*, the last by *Rufinus*, which, on account of the liberty he owns himself to have taken, cannot be entirely depended on.

6. Finally, we find Origen himself offers up, what we would call, prayers to *Christ*. for, in his 18th homily on *Exodus*, he says, O Lord *Jesus*, grant unto me, that I may deserve to have some memorial in thy tabernacle. *Domine Jesu, presta mihi ut aliquod monumenti habere merear in tabernaculo tuo.* And in his 5th homily on *Leviticus*, it behooveth me to call on my Lord *Jesus*, that he may cause me seeking to find. *Domine, nunc Jesum invocare me oportet, ut querentem me faciat invenire.* And in his 26th homily on *Numbers*, But let us pray the Word of God, — that he may vouchsafe to reveal these things to us. *Nos autem vocemus verbum Dei, — ut nobis hoc revelare dignetur.* But indeed we have these homilies only in the Latin translation by *Ruffinus*, who owns he added some things. Wherefore they cannot be depended on as so sure an evidence of his thoughts and practice as his Greek writings.

Upon the whole, then, I flatter myself, it must appear, there is no force in the passage which Mr. *Lindsey* produces from Origen to shew that it was against the almost universal practice and opinion of the church, in his time, to address religious worship to any but the Father. — By Origen's own testimony, a little after, some prayed to *Christ*. — He himself moreover admits supplications, and intercessions, and thanksgivings, might be presented to him. — Nay, even prayer, in an improper sense. — Finally, we find through his writings, he himself offered such addresses to him, as few or none would scruple, in our age, to pronounce prayers. It must then be of little service to the cause which Mr. *Lindsey* hath espoused.

Thus, I have considered all which Mr. *Lindsey* hath advanced to invalidate the force of those texts which are commonly urged to vindicate our invocation of the Lord *Jesus*; and have evinced, if I mis-

take not, that, notwithstanding his objections to that explication of them, on which this practice is built, and his additional arguments from Christ's own example, and from his words to his apostles, *In that day ye shall ask me nothing*, they do still justify our making addresses to him. — I have likewise examined his assertion about the omission of this homage to *Christ* in the ancient church, and, if I do not deceive myself, have shewn, that they made religious addresses to him, and in particular that *Origen* did so, whatever contrary appearance the passage, alledged by *Mr. Lindsey* out of the writings of that Father, may, at first sound, carry in it; although indeed, as was said, it is of little moment to the decision of the point in debate, whether the fact is this way or not.

To conclude then, if my interpretation of the places of scripture be right, it follows, sir, that your position, "That the addresses of Christians may, with the same propriety, be directed to the virgin *Mary*, as to the person of our Lord," is far from being true. For, the justice of the above reasoning being supposed, it is plain, *Christ* is pointed out as the object of worship † to the glory of God even his Father, in the texts which have been examined.

† I am aware some find fault with the application of the term *worship*, to any honour which is subordinate, instead of being ultimate and supreme. But why should this be thought any abuse of it? Though the word *προσκύνησις*, rendered *worship* both in the *Old* and *New Testament*, occur for supreme honour and respect, it is also taken for that which is lower and inferior — for the homage of a servant to a master, of a subject to a prince; of the disciples and disciples to *Jesus*, whom they regarded as a prophet, *Matth.* xviii. 26. 1 *Chron.* xxix. 20. *Matth.* viii. 2. ix. 18. *Mark* v. 6. *Matth.* xv. 25. And indeed in all these places of our English Bible the word, *worship*, hath this acceptation at present; as it hath also in others, *Luke* xiv. 10. *Daniel* iii. 28. *Jer.* x. 25. Nor is the same use of the word unknown in some other books, which were composed or translated in the 1st century.

The consequence, therefore, is, that we may offer supplications and thanksgivings to *Jesus*, nay that we ought to do so, in conformity to the pattern of the apostles and early believers : though still, in general, our prayers and praises, according to the model of the New Testament, are to be offered to God through him. Whether, however, my exposition of the texts which have been reviewed is sound or erroneous, true or false, you and he must judge for yourselves, as in the sight of God. It is unquestionably the unalienable right of every Christian to search the scriptures, and to frame his opinions about religious doctrines, according to what he conceives to be their genuine meaning and import.

May God incline all Christians to a fair and impartial study of these sacred repositories of divine truth ! May he enable them wherein they agree, to walk steadily and circumspectly, by the same rule ! And, if in any thing, notwithstanding such unbiassed search and inquiry, they be otherwise minded, may he reveal even this unto them !

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

PHILALETHES.

THE END.

ERRATA

- P. 1. l. 7. from the bottom. Take out the comma after *and*, and place it after the next word *here*.
- P. 7. l. 8. of the note, for *so* the reader, read *at the reader*.
- P. 8. l. 17. For *open earth*, read *of the earth*.
- P. 9. l. 7. from the bottom of the note, for *an* *refraction*, read *on the column*.
- P. 9. l. 11. Put a comma after *add*, and take it out after *the*.
- P. 9. l. 12. from the bottom, for *Offenbach*, read *Offenbach*.
- P. 10. l. 19. Add a comma after *and*.
- P. 10. l. 5. from the bottom, insert a comma after *and*.
- P. 10. l. 12. from the bottom, after *and* put a comma.
- P. 10. l. 13. Instead of *and*, read *and*.
- P. 10. l. 14. from the bottom, Take out the word *and* after *and*, and place it in the next line after *and*.
- P. 10. l. 6. For *then* read *but*.
- P. 10. l. 4. from the bottom. Put a note of interrogation after *hence*.
- P. 17. l. 1. Read *peace from God, our Father*.
- P. 19. l. 24. Put a comma after the word *read*.
- P. 20. l. 1. Take out the word *if*.
- P. 20. l. 6. Put a period after *and*, take out the word *and*, and put a period after *delivered*.
- P. 20. l. 9. from the bottom of the note, instead of *and* read *and*.
- P. 23. l. 23. After *place* put a period.

THE END